

RECEIVED

9 MS. SWARTZ: My name is Ginger Swartz and I
10 SEP 30 1999 represent the Office of the Governor, Nevada Agency for Nuclear
11 Projects. I'm here to deliver a statement on behalf of Robert
12 Loux, the Executive Director of the Office of the Governor,
13 Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects.

14 This statement has already been filed of record,
15 and in interest of time, to give all the citizens of Pahrump an
16 opportunity to speak, I'm going to cut off the first part of
17 this -- the general information on the front of this
18 presentation and go to the meat of it.

19 We're here today because the National
20 Environmental Protection Act regulations include the
21 requirement that federal agencies hold hearings to record and
22 then consider the comments of the public on EIS's they intend
23 to issue.

24 In the Final EIS, agencies must incorporate these
25 comments or explain why they did not incorporate them.

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

11
/

1 Agencies must also accept written comments from the public on
2 the Draft EIS's they issue.

3 Despite the Nuclear Waste Policy Act exempting
4 repository siting conditions from the heart of a true NEPA
5 analysis, this Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the
6 proposed actions are still seriously flawed in a number of
7 ways.

1 8 [The Draft EIS does not analyze impacts associated
9 with specific nuclear waste transportation routes, even though
10 it is intended that this document will be used at sometime in
11 the future to select transportation modes and routes to Yucca
12 Mountain.]

2... 13 [With respect to southern Nevada and Nye County,
14 neither the text descriptions nor the maps contained in the
15 draft document provide sufficient information about the exact
16 location of the proposed quarter mile wide rail corridor to
17 allow reviewers to evaluate impacts of the proposed action on
18 the affected environment as required under NEPA.

19 Consequently meaningful analysis of impacts
20 within five miles of the potential Jean rail corridor through
21 Clark and southern Nye Counties is virtually impossible.

22 The Draft EIS chapter on the environmental impact
23 of transportation does not adequately address the consequences
24 of rail line construction and operation along the entire Jean
25 corridor.

2 cont. 1 The assumptions regarding environmental
2 approvals, right-of-way acquisitions, engineering feasibility
3 and construction requirements for the Jean corridor are overly
4 optimistic, while the documents systematically underestimates
5 adverse environmental impact of rail construction and operation
6 along the Jean corridor.]

3 7 [The assessment of land use and socioeconomic
8 impacts associated with spent nuclear transportation in Nevada
9 is wholly inadequate.

10 In particular, the Draft EIS fails to address the
11 economic consequences of a severe accident or terrorist attack
12 resulting in release of radioactive materials.

13 Such an incident along the route, for example,
14 could have catastrophic impacts on economic activities such as
15 tourism and recreation, ranching and agriculture and retirement
16 community development.

17 Even if such an accident or incident does not
18 occur, public perception of radiological risks associated with
19 such shipments could have significant adverse socioeconomic
20 impacts on existing communities and discourage new investments.]

4... 21 [The Draft EIS fails to identify the Pahrump
22 Valley as potentially affected by legal weight and heavy haul
23 truck shipments of spent nuclear fuel and high-level
24 radioactive waste.

25 According to DOE's own estimates, there could be

4 cont.

1 up to 96,000 legal weight and 300 heavy haul truck shipments
2 under the mostly truck scenario.

3 Under the mostly rail scenario, up to 3,700 legal
4 weight and 19,845 heavy haul shipments could occur.

5 Nevertheless, the Draft EIS ignores environmental
6 impacts of truck shipments along this State Route 160 highway
7 corridor.]

5

8 [The Draft EIS also underestimates routine
9 radiation exposures in communities such as Pahrump where
10 hotels, casinos, retail businesses, schools and churches are
11 concentrated within 150 yards of the highway, often near
12 intersections or traffic signals and/or in reduced speed zones.]

6

13 [The large number of daily truck shipments could
14 heighten the public perception of radiological risks, lowering
15 property values and discouraging business expansion.]

7

16 With respect to the Yucca Mountain facility
17 itself, [this Draft EIS does not describe the proposed
18 repository in a manner that allows analysis of its impacts.]

9...

19 [A number of design alternatives and options are
20 described and their impacts evaluated.

21 DOE's expectation is that whatever design for the
22 repository is finally selected, its impacts will have been
23 bounded by the analysis of the alternatives and the options
24 within the document.

25 The range of possible impacts, however, is wide

9 cont. 1 and they all lead to releases of radionuclides from the
2 repository that contaminate a groundwater source currently used
3 for drinking water and agricultural purposes in Nye County.

4 What we don't know and can't know from this Draft
5 EIS is how much will be released, how fast it will be released
6 and how soon it will be released.

7 In simple terms, this Draft EIS does not tell us
8 what the future risks of the proposed repository are to people
9 and the environment.]

10 [It is well documented that people react strongly
11 and negatively to nuclear waste facilities and activities. In
12 fact, nuclear waste is consistently ranked among the highest
13 risks to be encountered.

14 In response to such perceptions, people behave in
15 ways that have direct and measurable economic consequences,
16 such as avoidance of places and products associated with
17 nuclear imagery or stigma.

18 The Draft EIS ignores this finding and does not
19 consider the economic consequences of such stigma to cities
20 such as Las Vegas and other tourist destinations and to rural
21 communities like Pahrump that rely heavily on economic sectors
22 such as agriculture and tourism.]

23 The State of Nevada will be submitting extensive
8... 24 written comments on this Draft EIS, and [it is our hope that
25 these comments and those of all others will be seriously

8 cont. 1 considered and that a reasonable no action alternative is
2 selected as the preferred action in the Final -- Final
3 Environmental Impact Statement.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. BOOTH: Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Okay. Next is Les Bradshaw.